

Docket No.: 10004402-1  
47429-00020USPT  
(PATENT)

### REMARKS

Reconsideration and Allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application.

Claim 29 has been amended.

#### Regarding to § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 2, 4, 12, 19-21 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wu (US Patent No. 6,567,467).

Applicant respectfully submits that although Wu does disclose a receiver for receiving a digital signal, the Wu decision comparators, pointed out by the Examiner in Figure 3, element 304, are in the feedback path of the receiver. Furthermore, Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Wu does not explicitly state that the frequency of operation of the Wu receiver is a fraction of the frequency of the incoming digital data. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner with respect to the operating frequency of the comparator circuits of Wu. Applicant respectfully points out that the delays of Wu do not change the operating frequency, but instead merely delay the digital data. Thus, there is no operating frequency change in the Wu feedback section 114. Instead there is a time shift of the data provided by the d(i) signal line going to each of the Wu comparator circuits 304. As such, Applicant respectfully points out that there is no teaching in Wu that the plurality of decision circuits are or are not operating at a frequency that is a fraction of the bit rate of the digital signal. Wu is quiet and offers no inherent insight with respect to this element.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Docket No.: 10004402-1  
47429-00020USPT  
(PATENT)

Applicant respectfully points out that a claim is properly rejected under §102 only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or is inherently described in a single prior art reference.

Regarding Claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses the §102 rejection. Claim 1 recites, among other things, a plurality of decision circuits "operating at a frequency that is a fraction of the bit rate of the digital signal and generating an output signal corresponding to the state of the digital signal." Furthermore, Claim 1 recites "a plurality of decision circuits, each decision circuit comprising a comparator circuit and having an input connected to a communications channel over which a digital signal is communicated." Again, Applicant points out that Wu does not teach or anticipate the decision circuits operating at a frequency that is a fraction of the bit rate of the digital signal. Instead, Wu teaches that the decision circuits, found in the feedback path, receive various delayed versions of the signal  $d(i)$ . Wu does not teach, anticipate or discuss anything with respect with the clock frequency of the decision circuits. As such, Applicant respectfully points out that Wu does not anticipate Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 1 is ready for allowance.

Claims 2 and 4 are each directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 1 and are therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as stated above with respect Claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §102 rejection with respect to Claim 12. Applicant respectfully points out that Claim 12 recites a method for receiving digital signals. The method includes "providing a plurality of comparator circuits each responsive to a different clock signal." Wu does not teach nor anticipate a plurality of comparator circuits that are each responsive to a different clock signal. Wu is silent with respect to the clock signals that its

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

Docket No.: 10004402-1  
47429-00020USPT  
(PATENT)

comparators respond to. The WU decision circuits receive delayed input signals. Thus, there is no apparent or inherent reason for the Wu decision circuits 304 to each be responsive to different clock signals. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn and submits that Claim 12 is ready for allowance.

Claim 19 is directly dependent on Claim 12 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 12. Applicant respectfully requests that this §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant traverses the §102 rejection of Claim 20. Claim 20 recites a receiver for receiving digital signals. The recited receiver comprises "a plurality of decision circuits, each comprising a comparator circuit, the comparator circuit each responsive to a different clock signal." Again, Applicant respectfully submits that Wu does not teach nor anticipate the use of a different clock signal for each decision circuit 304 of Wu. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Wu does not anticipate Claim 20 and respectfully requests that this §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 21 is directly dependent upon Claim 20 and is therefore not anticipated for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to Claim 20. Applicant respectfully requests that §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant has made a clarifying amendment to Claim 29 making clear that the comparator means is found "in a non-feedback path of said receiver." As such, Applicant respectfully points out that Wu and none of the art cited by the Examiner now or in previous office actions teach or anticipate the use of a comparator means in a non-feedback portion of a receiver for receiving digital signals (see previous amendments). As such, Applicant respectfully submits that Wu does not teach nor anticipate the receiver for receiving digital

Docket No.: 10004402-1  
47429-00020USPT  
(PATENT)

signals as recited in independent Claim 29 and therefore requests that this §102 rejection be withdrawn.

**Regarding the Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 35-37 are allowed.

Applicant further appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 3, 5-11, 13-18, 22-28 and 30-34 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that based on the present traversal of the §102 rejection, there is no need, at this time, for Applicant to rewrite the claims in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims.

In view of the above amendments, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: 11/23 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Steven R. Greenfield

Registration No.: 38,166

HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

1445 Ross Avenue, Suite 3200

Dallas, Texas 75202

(214) 855-4500

Attorneys For Applicant